

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office action dated July 7, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-10 are pending in the present Application. Claims 1, 6 and 8 are amended, Claims 3 and 10 are Withdrawn-Currently Amended and Claims 5 and 7 are cancelled without prejudice, leaving Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8 and 9 for consideration upon entry of the present amendments and following remarks.

Support for the amendments to the claims is at least found in the specification, the figures, and the claims as originally filed. More particularly, support for amended Claims 1 and 8 is at least found in cancelled Claims 5 and 7. Claim 6 is amended to provide proper dependency based on cancelled Claims 5 and 7.

No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Specification

The Examiner indicates that the title of the invention is not descriptive and that a new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The following title is suggested: "Liquid Crystal Display Having Angled Pixel and Common Electrode Lines." Applicants gratefully thank the Examiner for the suggested language and amend the title of the invention accordingly. Reconsideration and entry of the new title are respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 3 and 10 are objected to because of informalities. Particularly, the claims refer to "the edges of the common electrode line and the pixel electrode line," but there are two edges of each, and they are not parallel to each other. The Examiner has indicated that these claims are being considered as referring to the "first edge." Claims 3 and 10 are further objected to because

“makes clockwise obtuse angles” in line 3 of the claims should be “makes counterclockwise obtuse angles.”

In response, Applicants have amended Claims 3 and 10 accordingly. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the relevant claim objections are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 2, 4, 8 and 9

Claims 1, 2, 4, 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Suzuki et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,905,556 (hereinafter “Suzuki”) in view of Mori et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,367,179 (hereinafter “Mori”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art and that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970); *Amgen v. Chugai Pharmaceuticals Co.*, 927 U.S.P.Q.2d, 1016, 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

As discussed above, Claims 1 and 8 are amended to include the subject matter of cancelled Claims 5 and 7 to recite, *inter alia*,

“wherein the pixel electrode and the common electrode are curved and a pitch of the curving of the pixel electrode and the common electrode is larger than about 50 microns.”

Suzuki and Mori do not teach or suggest the pixel electrode and the common electrode are curved and a pitch of the curving of the pixel electrode and the common electrode is larger than about 50 microns of amended Claims 1 and 8.

Therefore, Suzuki and Mori, alone or in combination, *do not teach or suggest all of the limitations* of amended Claims 1 and 8. Thus, *prima facie* obviousness does not exist regarding amended Claims 1 and 8 with respect to Suzuki and Mori.

Claims 5-7

Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Mori and further in view of Ono et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,774,956 (hereinafter "Ono"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. Claims 5 and 7 are hereinabove cancelled without prejudice and rejections are rendered moot for these claims.

As discussed above, As discussed above, Claims 1 and 8 are amended to include the subject matter of cancelled Claims 5 and 7 to recite, *inter alia*,

"wherein the pixel electrode and the common electrode are curved and a pitch of the curving of the pixel electrode and the common electrode is larger than about 50 microns."

In the Office action, it is conceded that Suzuki and Mori do not disclose that the "pixel electrode and common electrode are curved," now of amended Claim 1 (previously Claim 5). Ono is relied upon as teaching "the pixel and common electrode are curved."

Since Suzuki does not teach or suggest "a curved pixel electrode and common electrode," Suzuki necessarily does not teach or suggest the pitch of the curving of the pixel electrode and common electrode is larger than about 50 microns of amended Claim 1. view

Notwithstanding that Suzuki does not teach or suggest "pixel electrode and common electrode are curved" of amended Claim 1, it is stated on Page 6 of the Office action that the pitch of the curving of the electrodes is the vertical length of the pixel region. It is further stated that Suzuki disclosing that the pixel region as being 110 μ m x 330 μ m teaches the pitch is larger than about 50 μ m of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In a non-limiting exemplary embodiment, the claimed invention is described with pixel electrodes 190 and common electrodes 133 being oblique and *curved* (See paragraph 0073) and a pitch of the curve is larger than about 50 microns (See paragraph 0076).

To the contrary, Suzuki discloses a size of *one pixel* is 110 μ m x 330 μ m. (Col. 6, lines 34-37.) Referring to FIG. 9, the source electrode S and the common electrode CE divide *one pixel area* into four sub-pixel areas SP1, SP2, SP3 and SP4. (Col. 5, lines 22-25.) That is, the pitch of a *curved electrode* in no way relates to *one pixel area* of Suzuki. The overall size of one pixel as disclosed by Suzuki not disclose a "**curving of the pixel electrode and common electrode**" of the claimed invention.

Additionally, even for the purpose of this response if Suzuki were considered as teaching or suggesting "pixel electrode and common electrode are curved" of amended Claim 1, Suzuki does

not teach or suggest the pitch of the curving of the pixel electrode and common electrode is larger than about 50 microns of amended Claim 1. Referring again to FIG. 9 for example, Suzuki discloses the cross pieces of the source electrode S and the common electrode CE are 3 μ m in width and 15 μ m in pitch. Clearly, Suzuki does not teach or suggest the pitch of the curving of the pixel electrode and common electrode is larger than about 50 microns of amended Claim 1. In fact, Suzuki discloses a pitch of electrodes *less than 50 microns*, contrary to the claimed invention.

Therefore, Suzuki, Mori and Ono, alone or in combination, *do not teach or suggest all of the limitations* of amended Claim 1 as including the limitations of Claims 5 and 7. Thus, *prima facie* obviousness does not exist regarding amended Claim 1 with respect to Suzuki, Mori and Ono.

Thus, *prima facie* obviousness does not exist regarding amended Claims 1 and 8 with respect to Suzuki, Mori and Ono. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 8 are not further rejected or objected to and are therefore allowable. Claims 2, 4, 6 and 9 variously depend from Claims 1 and 8, respectively, and are correspondingly allowable. Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8 and 9 are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All of the objections and rejections are herein overcome. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. No new matter is added by way of the present Amendments and Remarks, as support is found throughout the original filed specification, claims and drawings. Prompt issuance of Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' attorney at the below listed phone number regarding this response or otherwise concerning the present application.

Applicants hereby petition for any necessary extension of time required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a) or 1.136(b) which may be required for entry and consideration of the present Reply.

If there are any charges due with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130 maintained by Applicants' attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: /Amy Bizon-Copp/
Amy Bizon-Copp
Reg. No. 53,993
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115

Date: November 7, 2006